

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program *Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 2, 2013*

Applicant	City of Upland	Amount Requested	\$2,500,000
------------------	----------------	-------------------------	-------------

Proposal Title	14 th Street Storm Water Collection and Integration Basin Project	Total Proposal Cost	\$5,500,000
-----------------------	--	----------------------------	-------------

PROJECT SUMMARY

The project installs approximately 4,700 ft of storm water collection and diversion pipelines, ranging from 24-inch to 84-inch, and constructs a 232 acre-foot (AF) detention/retention basin designed to contain a 100-year flood event. The basin will serve as a recharge point as well as a collecting arm for the existing Upland Basin.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	3/15	Technical Justification	4/10
Budget	2/5		
Schedule	2/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	6/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	1/5	Program Preferences	4/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			22

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is minimally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. A comprehensive overview of the project is not supplied, just a brief two-paragraph summary of the project, a map, and design drawings. The applicant does not include tasks, deliverables, current project status, or a description of the anticipated permits needed. Applicant does not describe how the proposed project helps meet the goals and objectives of the adopted IRWM Plan. Lastly, the work plan does not contain Data Management and Monitoring deliverables that are consistent with the "Data Management" IRWM Plan Standard.

BUDGET

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. Proposal does not contain detailed cost information for all budget categories. Consequently, many of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable, and supporting documentation is lacking for all of the budget categories. There are no estimates of hours, labor categories, or rates for any of the budget categories. The construction budget categories contain some additional detail, including material quantities and unit costs, but these quantities are not supported by other information sources such as the work plan. This detailed budget is not consistent with the summary budget, nor is it consistent with the work plan or Schedule. Applicant does not specify the source of funding for the non-State or other-State share.

SCHEDULE

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The schedule is not consistent with the tasks presented in the work plan and budget. The schedule only covers bid advertisement and construction activities. The schedule is missing significant milestones and most of the necessary project tasks. Reasonableness cannot be determined, due to the lack of detail.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is minimally addressed and not documented. The applicant does not include the required Project Performance Measures Table or a commensurate narrative. As a consequence, no goals or monitoring targets are identified to demonstrate that the benefits claimed are appropriate. While it is feasible that the measurement tools and methods, such as flow metering, can monitor project performance, the absence of monitoring targets makes it impossible to judge whether Flood Risk Reduction can be accomplished in an effective quantifiable manner.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The technical justification cannot be determined due to a lack of documentation and physical benefits are not well described. The applicant did not provide information that clearly describes the physical benefits claimed. For example, there is no with and without project characterization for the flood damage reduction (FDR) benefits claimed. The applicant simply states that project will protect 220 acres from flooding. There is no explanation of how many structures within 220 acres will be protected. Also, backup documents are supplied, but they are not referenced, nor summarized in the narrative, so it is unclear how the documents support the feasibility of the project.

BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a low level of benefits in relationship to cost, and the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking. Project construction cost is \$5.5 million in Attachment 4. No costs are provided in Attachment 8 to account for annual operation and maintenance. No opportunity cost of the land is included.

FDR benefits are shown in Table 12 as \$0.27 million per year, but the basis for this estimate cannot be verified. No supporting information is provided on inundation areas, depths, structures or utilities affected. No overall summary of costs and benefits for the project is provided.

Water supply benefits were calculated using the average of Metropolitan Water District Tier 1 and Tier 2 rates times an average volume captured and percolated. No adjustment or explanation is made to account for where the captured

water would have gone or how it might have been used downstream. Prado Dam and other groundwater storage operations downstream could capture some or much of this water for beneficial use.

Unquantified benefits were briefly mentioned but not explained.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant claims that 3 program preferences and 3 statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. However, applicant demonstrates this with a high degree of certainty, and adequately documents the magnitude and breadth to which each will be achieved for only 4 of the preferences claimed. The proposal will achieve the following: (1) Include regional projects or programs; (2) Contribute to attainment of one or more of the objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program; (3) Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently; and (4) Practice Integrated Flood Management.